

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

PAT SCHOTTLER,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

STATE OF WISCONSIN, KRISTINA E.
WILLIAMSON, JANE/JOHN DOE,

16-cv-415-jdp

Defendants.

Plaintiff Pat Schottler, appearing pro se, brought this action for alleged violations of his First Amendment right to freedom of speech. I took Schottler to be alleging that his right to freedom of speech was violated on two occasions: (1) when the St. Croix County Circuit Court enjoined him from harassing Jane Doe; and (2) when the state court denied his request to order the news media to publish his harassment case on the news. Schottler named as defendants Jane Doe, Kristina E. Williamson (Doe's attorney), and the State of Wisconsin. His other submissions suggested that he would also like to bring claims against the state court judges who entered orders against him and denied his requests for relief. I granted defendants' motions to dismiss in a November 15, 2016 order, stating that the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine barred his claims seeking review of the state court decisions, defendant State of Wisconsin was immune from suit, defendant Williamson, a private attorney, could not be liable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 because she was not a state actor, and Schottler had not alleged any wrongdoing on the part of defendant Doe. Dkt. 20. I denied Schottler's Rule 59 motions in a March 24, 2017 order. Dkt. 39. The Court of Appeals affirmed this court's judgment on April 14. *Schottler v. Wisconsin*, No. 16-4087, 2017 WL 1364982 (7th Cir. 2017).

My order on the Rule 59 motions appears to have crossed in the mail with a new document filed by Schottler titled “Response by opposing parties is not sufficient.” Dkt. 40. Perhaps Schottler meant this to be a brief in support of his previously filed Rule 59 motions, in which case it is too late to be considered. If he intended it to be its own standalone Rule 60 motion, this court may consider it. But I will deny this motion because it does nothing more than press arguments that this court and the Seventh Circuit have already rejected. Nothing in his new submission persuades me that I was incorrect in dismissing his claims.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Pat Schottler’s motion for relief from judgment, Dkt. 40, is DENIED.

Entered April 19, 2017.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

JAMES D. PETERSON
District Judge